

REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Johnson for the courtesy of a teleconference on **January 10, 2008** to discuss the Advisory Action of December 12, 2007. Accordingly, this response is being re-submitted based upon our understanding of the allowability of the claims as submitted during this teleconference.

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action mailed September 10, 2007, and thank Examiner Johnson for her detailed review of the pending claims. In response to the Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 13 and 26, canceled claims 14, 16-18, 20, 23, 28-29, and 31-32, and added new claims 33-37. By way of this amendment, no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 13, 15, 19, 21-22, 24-27, 30, and 33-37 remain pending in this application. At least for the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections. Further, Applicants believe that there are also reasons other than those set forth below why the pending claims are patentable, and reserves the right to set forth those reasons, and to argue for the patentability of claims not explicitly addressed herein, in future papers. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the above amendment, the new claims, and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 13, 15, 19, 22, 24-27, 30, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hansen, US Patent 5,025,126. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 20, 21, and 28 would be patentable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, independent claim 13 has been amended to include the recitations of canceled dependent claim 20; independent claim 26 incorporates the recitations of canceled dependent claim 28; and new claim 33 incorporates the recitations of independent claim 13, dependent claim 21 and intervening dependent claim 15. Therefore, independent claims 13, 26, and 33 are allowable, as indicated by the Examiner in the Office Action of September 10, 2007.

Further, dependent claims 15, 19, 21-22, 24-25, 27, 30, and 34-37 are allowable by being dependent on an allowable base claim. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment and remarks, the pending application is in condition for allowance. If, however, there are any outstanding issues that can be resolved by telephone conference, the Examiner is earnestly encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative.

It is believed no fees are due with this response. However, if any fees are required in connection with the filing of this paper that are not identified in any accompanying transmittal, permission is given to charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. 66835-0003 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 is hereby made, the fee for which should also be charged to this Deposit Account.

Dated: January 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic Signature: /Kenneth W. Jarrell/
Michael B. Stewart
Registration No. 36,018
Kenneth W. Jarrell
Registration No.: 52,484
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
39533 Woodward Avenue
Suite 140
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304
(248) 593-3310
Attorneys for Applicant

R0470509.DOC